

believe that the problems of welfare policy are so complex and difficult that it is a mistake to believe that there is only one approach that will work. This bill is intended to encourage State experimentation with approaches that will work.

In the final analysis, Mr. President, this vote challenges us to decide whether or not we want to perpetuate the status quo. In my view, the status quo is unacceptable. Therefore, I will support this legislation and the effort to bring about fundamental welfare reforms.

SOUTH DAKOTA'S WORKFARE WORKS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, as the Senate once again nears final action on a workfare bill, I am reminded of an old commonsense saying, "Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime". This sums up the clear, fundamental difference between today's failed liberal welfare system and the commonsense reform bill before us. The current welfare system has failed. We all know it. Instead of assisting needy Americans, the current system holds Americans down, perpetuates a cycle of dependency, increases moral decay, and cripples self-respect. Welfare was meant to be a safety net, not a way of life. The bill before us would change the system and the lives of many Americans for the better. This bill would restore the values of personal responsibility and self-sufficiency by making work, not Government benefits, the centerpiece of welfare. I am proud to be a part of the team that has brought this historic legislation to the floor.

Why does the current system not work? Generations of able-bodied families have stayed on the dole rather than work. The rationale is simple: Welfare recipients today can sit at home and make more each week than individuals working full time on the minimum wage. This disincentive to work is an insult to hardworking Americans. In essence, we have a Government program that challenges the American work ethic. South Dakotans demonstrate that a hard work ethic provides for themselves and their families. Many work long hours, seek overtime, or have two, even three jobs to make ends meet. Imagine how they must feel when their tax dollars are used to support Americans who need not work. I can tell you how they feel—upset. If we work for our wages, welfare recipients should work for benefits. That is why we need workfare.

I am pleased Chairman ROTH included my workfare amendments during the Finance Committee's markup consideration of welfare reform. These amendments would ensure that welfare recipients put in a full work week, just as other Americans do, in order to receive benefits. These entitlements would increase the number of welfare recipients who must work and avoid a liberal loophole to avoid real work.

Workfare is not a new idea. Fifteen years ago, South Dakotans wanted to

address their own special needs and develop real solutions for their welfare system. South Dakota wanted workfare, not welfare. The problem is, Federal law makes it difficult to experiment with workfare, especially since the current administration has sought to protect the current, failed system. For example, in August 1993, South Dakota sought a Federal waiver to operate a workfare program. That waiver took nearly a year to approve. Today, South Dakota has a system that requires recipients to sign a social contract and imposes a tough 2-year time limit on benefits. This approach has worked. South Dakota has successfully decreased its welfare caseload by 17 percent since January 1993 and saved more than \$5.6 million. South Dakota's experience is proof that workfare works.

Just as important are the success stories behind the statistics—the South Dakotans who have moved from welfare to work. Let me share two such stories about two very special ladies with unique circumstances: Marilou Manguson of Rapid City and Belinda Mayer of Sioux Falls. They deserve our praise. Marilou and her 10-year-old son were receiving AFDC and food stamps. When she applied for welfare, she was informed she would have to get a job. For 4 months, Marilou attended computer and accounting courses, and prepared every day for interviews with the South Dakota Job Service Job Club. Two weeks later she found a full time job with a government sales agency. In contrast, 20 years ago, when Marilou was on welfare, she says all one needed to do is show up to get a check. Marilou now knows the old system didn't help her. She said, "You can't just sit at home and do nothing. You have to get out and do something for yourself." She's absolutely right. Today, Marilou is not receiving any welfare assistance.

When Belinda Mayer's ex-husband quit paying child support, she was left to care for a child, but was only earning \$6 per hour. Belinda applied for welfare benefits so she could obtain a 2-year accounting degree from Western Dakota Technical Institute [WDTI] and, hopefully, find a better job. She continued to receive benefits while she went to school and was able to obtain child support. This May, Belinda graduated and found a job right away as a commercial service specialist with Norwest Bank in Sioux Falls. For Belinda, welfare reform is a very important issue. As she says, help should be there, "but it should not become a crutch" for people. Both of these women can look forward to a very stable, solid future for themselves and their families. I am very proud of their hard work and applaud their efforts.

Their success is South Dakota's success. South Dakota has reached out to enable those in times of difficulty to regain control of their lives.

These examples demonstrate that workfare is achieving success at the

local level. South Dakota was fortunate to get its waiver approved to run a workfare program. Other States are still waiting for waiver approval. This waiver process reflects a basic problem: a one-size-fits-all system run by Federal bureaucrats. Welfare cannot be solved one waiver at a time. Federal bureaucrats have worked to preserve the current, failed system by being slow to approve State waivers. That must change. States should be given the flexibility to seek solutions and alternatives to welfare problems. I have more faith in South Dakotans' dedication to welfare reform than I do in Washington bureaucrats.

Clearly, we need greater State flexibility also because there is not a grand, "one-size" solution to ending welfare dependency. Welfare reform programs in Oglala, Fort Thompson, or Rapid City, SD may not necessarily work in Los Angeles or New Orleans. South Dakota's welfare problems are unique, and even differ greatly from our nearest neighbors. My State has three of the five poorest counties in the country. We have some of the lowest wages in the country. We also have the highest percentage of welfare recipients who are Native Americans. In some reservation areas, unemployment runs higher than 80 percent. Long distances between towns and a lack of public transportation and quality child care are further barriers to gainful employment.

To promote greater State flexibility, the bill before us would provide welfare assistance in the form of block grants to the States. Block grants would give States the freedom to craft solutions that best serve local needs. It has been proven time and again that Washington bureaucrats cannot understand unique local needs from thousands of miles away. The distance, both literally and figuratively, that separates Washington from our cities and towns prevents the most appropriate solutions from being tailored to our problems.

Workfare is not just about restoring responsibility at the individual and State level, it is about protecting children in need. The workfare bill before us would ensure that children have quality food and shelter. This bill would increase our investment in child care by \$4.5 billion and increase child protection and neglect funds by \$200 million over current law. What this bill eliminates is cumbersome bureaucracy and needless regulations.

The bill also would strengthen child support enforcement and give States new tools to crack down on deadbeat parents. These reforms represent the toughest child support laws ever passed by Congress. One woman in South Dakota has informed me that her ex-husband owes her thousands of dollars in overdue child support. For her and many other parents in the same difficult situation, this bill would help. The current system fosters illegitimacy and discourages marriage and